

1 [Counsel Listed on Signature Page]
2
3
4
5

6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
8 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

9
10 IN RE: JUUL LABS, INC. ANTITRUST
11 LITIGATION

12 This Document Relates To:

13 **ALL ACTIONS**

14 Case No. 3:20-cv-02345-WHO

15 **JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT**

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888

1 Pursuant to the August 13, 2024 Notice Setting Zoom Hearing (ECF No. 410), the Direct
 2 Purchaser, Indirect Purchaser, and Indirect Reseller Antitrust Plaintiffs (“Plaintiffs”); Defendants
 3 Altria Group, Inc. and Altria Enterprises LLC (“Altria”); and Juul Labs, Inc., Nicholas Pritzker,
 4 and Riaz Valani (“JLI”) (collectively “Defendants”) (all collectively “Parties”), jointly submit
 5 this Statement for the February 11, 2025 Case Management Conference.

6 **I. STATUS OF DISCOVERY**

7 **Fact Discovery.** Fact discovery closed on November 15, 2024. The Parties have concluded all
 8 party and non-party depositions. Plaintiffs recently raised the potential of seeking fact discovery from
 9 Defendants’ expert, Mr. David Dobbins, on the basis that since 2023 he has been retained by Altria as a
 10 consultant. The Parties continue to meet and confer on this issue, and there is no pending dispute that is
 11 yet ripe.

12 **Expert Discovery.** On January 21, 2025, the Parties exchanged a total of 10 initial expert
 13 reports:

Party	Expert
DPPs	Dr. Steven H. Kelder
DPPs	Dr. Pierre Thomas Léger
DPPs	Dr. Bryan J. Perry
DPPs	Tara K. Singh
IPPs	Dr. Gareth Macartney
IRPs	Dr. Keith B. Leffler
Defendants	David Dobbins
Defendants	Deborah A. Garza
Defendants	Dr. Jack E. Henningfield
Defendants	Dr. Kevin M. Murphy

21 The deadline for expert rebuttals is March 21, 2025. Expert discovery closes on May 20, 2025.

22 **Expert Deposition Disputes.** The Parties have been meeting and conferring by email on the
 23 schedule and format for expert depositions. The Parties held a substantive meet-and-confer
 24 teleconference on January 31, 2025. Despite efforts to find agreement, the Parties have disputes as to the
 25 number, duration, and timing of expert depositions.

26 **I. Duration for the Deposition of Defendants’ Expert, Dr. Murphy.**

27 The Parties disagree on the time to be allotted for deposition of Defendants’ expert Dr. Murphy.

1 **Plaintiffs' Position:**¹

2 Unlike Defendants' other three experts, Dr. Murphy has authored a 207-page report which
 3 addresses liability (merits), class certification and damages and pertains to all three actions (DPP, IPP,
 4 and IRP). Each action's expert(s) make different points relevant to certifying each class and also
 5 propose their own methodologies to establish class-wide impact and estimate damages. Accordingly,
 6 Plaintiffs request 14 hours over two consecutive days to depose Dr. Murphy on his opening report and
 7 his anticipated rebuttal report.²

8 Good cause exists for Plaintiffs to conduct Dr. Murphy's deposition for up to 14 hours. Although
 9 not entirely clear before his rebuttal report(s) are served, Dr. Murphy's testimony likely will concern
 10 common issues across all three Plaintiff classes as well as issues pertaining to only one or two of the
 11 three classes. But regardless of any overlap of economic or other topics of questioning by the classes,
 12 each Plaintiff class will need to question Dr. Murphy concerning their experts' respective impact and
 13 damages models, *because they are not identical*, involving different econometric findings and relying
 14 on different materials in calculating overcharges. DPPs have four experts, two who cover areas relevant
 15 to Dr. Murphy's report, and IRPs and IPPs each have their own independent experts. For class
 16 certification, DPPs, IRPs, and IPPs all have *separate* classes of purchasers for which they are seeking
 17 certification. IPPs and IRPs must show pass-through of the initial overcharge, whereas DPPs do not.
 18 DPPs also bring claims under federal law whereas the IRPs and IPPs assert claims under the laws of
 19 states allowing such claims. The expert reports are also not bifurcated as in some complex cases; class
 20 certification and merits are presented together. The time to conduct Dr. Murphy's deposition ought not
 21 be decreased to the prejudice of any of the three Plaintiff classes, hence why Plaintiffs seek up to 14
 22 hours to conduct Dr. Murphy's deposition, given his unique importance to each of their actions. There is
 23

24 ¹ Plaintiffs offered to address these scheduling issues in a separate letter brief. Defendants refused and
 25 insisted on briefing the issue in this Case Management Conference Statement. Plaintiffs are happy to
 26 address these issues in the method the Court prefers.

27 ² Defendants have represented that Dr. Murphy intends to submit a rebuttal report. He will likely author
 28 a separate rebuttal to each one of Plaintiffs' economic experts (as permitted by the Court-approved
 29 schedule). Defendants also do not dispute that Dr. Murphy's rebuttal reports or report likely will
 30 address each of Plaintiffs' experts' separate and distinct methodologies of calculating damages for each
 31 class.

1 clear good cause to allow for two days of deposition and ensure that each case has sufficient time to
 2 cover their claims, and sufficient ground to rebut the *Daubert* challenges Defendants are expected to
 3 pose.

4 As the Court is aware, it is not unusual in complex matters (such as those involving separate
 5 plaintiff actions with differing theories of liability, impact and damages) that the parties agree at the
 6 outset to allow for additional time to depose expert witnesses. *See, e.g.*, Joint Case Management
 7 Statement in *Eon Corp. Holdings v. Apple, Inc.*, 2015 WL 3811652 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (Orrick) (Each side
 8 may take up to seven (7) hours of deposition testimony of each testifying expert for each report on a
 9 separate subject (*e.g.*, if an expert opines on infringement and validity, fourteen (14) hours of deposition
 10 testimony would be permitted); Case Management Order in *Finjan, Inc. v. Websense, Inc.*, 2014 WL
 11 2925309 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (same). Here, the Parties agreed to seven hours per witness. As Defendants
 12 concede, no distinction is made between fact and expert witnesses. Plaintiffs now seek additional time
 13 only to depose Dr. Murphy, because good cause exists for the three classes of Plaintiffs to conduct Dr.
 14 Murphy's deposition for up to 14 hours over two consecutive days, given the complexity of issues and
 15 Dr. Murphy's unique testimony in his opening report and in his anticipated rebuttal report concerning
 16 the reports of Plaintiffs' economic experts in the three cases. Plaintiffs have otherwise agreed to share
 17 up to seven hours among them to conduct the depositions of the Defendants three other experts: Ms.
 18 Garza, Dr. Henningfield, and Mr. Dobbins.³

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

³ Defendants seem to concede that Plaintiffs will be prejudiced if they are not permitted to question Dr. Murphy for more than seven hours, as they do not object to his deposition taking up to 12 hours; they just dispute that Dr. Murphy should be treated any differently than any other expert, even though he is the only one of Defendants' four experts whose testimony is uniquely relevant to each one of the three Plaintiffs' actions, which is why his deposition is the only one Plaintiffs request the Court's permission to conduct for up to 14 hours.

1 Defendants' Position:⁴

2 Defendants are not opposed to more than seven hours of deposition time for Dr. Murphy;
 3 indeed, as explained below, under Defendants' two proposals Plaintiffs would either have 14 or 12 hours
 4 of deposition time for Dr. Murphy. Defendants' objection is to Plaintiffs' contention that Dr. Murphy
 5 should be treated differently from every other witness.

6 Plaintiffs' assertion that because they represent three classes they would be entitled to take 21
 7 total deposition hours of each of Defendants' expert witnesses is wrong. The Deposition Protocol
 8 agreed by the Parties and entered by the Court provides that "the length of depositions of all 30(b)(1)
 9 witnesses noticed by any party will be seven on-the-record hours, excluding breaks and recesses off the
 10 record." ECF No. 446 § II.B. The Deposition Protocol does not distinguish between expert and fact
 11 witnesses.

12 Dr. Murphy is one witness, who has submitted one opening report, and who Defendants expect
 13 will submit one rebuttal report. His opening report addresses, from an economic perspective, the
 14 market for e-cigarettes and the lack of economic evidence supporting the allegation found in the
 15 complaints for all three classes that prices for closed system e-vapor products were raised, fixed,
 16 maintained, and/or stabilized at supra-competitive and/or artificially high levels. His rebuttal report
 17 will, Defendants expect, explain why Plaintiffs' experts are wrong to opine otherwise. Plaintiffs'
 18 argument in favor of additional deposition time with Dr. Murphy appears to be that because *they* chose
 19 to submit multiple, often conflicting, expert opinions on issues related to market impact and damages,
 20 they are entitled to additional deposition time with *Defendants'* expert. That is neither reasonable nor
 21 how expert discovery is ordinarily conducted. Nothing obligated Plaintiffs to rely on multiple experts.
 22 Their argument that it was necessary to do so ignores that the central thesis of the claims brought by all
 23 three classes are the same: that the prices JLI charged for its products were artificially high because of
 24 alleged unlawful anti-competitive acts of Defendants. Plaintiffs' decision not to coordinate their efforts
 25

26 ⁴ Plaintiffs' original draft CMC statement included both an argument on these issues and also
 27 contemplated submitting additional letter briefing on Friday, February 7. Defendants' objection was to
 28 burdening the Court with two separate submissions on these issues, one of which would not be
 submitted until shortly before the CMC. The Parties ultimately agreed to brief the issues as part of this
 statement.

1 in addressing that issue and to instead submit separate and inconsistent reports has already increased
 2 significantly the burden on Defendants. Aside from their own tactical decision, Plaintiffs fail to make
 3 any showing of why Dr. Murphy should be treated differently from any other witness.

4 Defendants are not averse to modification of the default deposition procedures for expert
 5 witnesses, but any accommodation should not be a one-way street. Plaintiffs demand twice as much
 6 time with Dr. Murphy while at the same time refusing to agree that experts who submit both opening
 7 and rebuttal reports can be deposed separately related to each of their submitted reports. As described
 8 in more detail below, Defendants believe a similar rule should apply for all witnesses.

9 **II. Number of Depositions for Each Expert and Allotment of Time for Each Expert**
 10 **Deposition.**

11 Defendants propose that the parties stipulate and agree that, for those expert witnesses who
 12 submit both an opening and a rebuttal report, the opposing party may take one seven-hour deposition
 13 related to the experts' opening reports and another seven-hour deposition related to that expert's
 14 rebuttal report. Plaintiffs disagree that there should be a blanket stipulation for two depositions for each
 15 of the 10 experts who have submitted reports. Rather, Plaintiffs submit that if Defendants see reason to
 16 have additional deposition time after rebuttals, they move for additional time and show why it meets
 17 the standard of good cause for that time. Alternatively, Defendants have offered that each expert who
 18 submits two reports should be deposed for a total of 12 hours. Under this alternative approach, the
 19 questioning side would have discretion as to when and how to allocate the 12 hours of deposition time.
 20 Plaintiffs do not agree to this alternative proposal because it does not address the core issue in dispute.

21 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

22 The parties agreed that each witness would be deposed for no more than seven hours. Now,
 23 rather than moving for leave to depose a particular expert witness for an additional amount of time as
 24 regards certain topics pursuant to the Federal Rules, Defendants beseech the Court for permission to
 25 multiply the proceedings by deposing each expert shortly after service of each of their reports (should
 26 they author a rebuttal report), necessarily increasing the time and expenses of the parties and the Court.
 27 Plaintiffs cannot agree that their collective six experts and Defendants' four experts should be subject to
 28 a second deposition—one before their rebuttal report is served on March 21 and another one afterward.

1 To the extent Defendants find a need for additional time to depose any expert after the rebuttal
 2 period (i.e., after depositions of the experts are conducted on their report(s)), Plaintiffs simply ask that
 3 they move for additional time pursuant to a showing of good cause, as Plaintiffs are doing now with
 4 respect solely to Dr. Murphy.⁵ Plaintiffs have agreed to produce their experts at a time of Defendants'
 5 choosing, either before or after rebuttal, but maintain that seeking an intervening deposition is
 6 inefficient, disruptive, and has the potential to cause confusion, and thus recommend that all parties
 7 conduct their depositions after service of all of the experts' reports.

8 At this time, before rebuttal, a blanket stipulation to take each expert twice is not only
 9 premature but extremely inefficient. With ten experts in different locations around the country (e.g., Los
 10 Angeles, CA; Washington, DC; Austin, TX; Chicago, IL; San Francisco, CA), it is incredibly inefficient
 11 to assume all would be deposed twice. There are seven teams of lawyers, many of whom will travel to
 12 each, twice. Defendants' proposal contemplates conducting 20 depositions in total without any
 13 justification that there is good cause for such inefficiency or such high-cost expenditure. Furthermore,
 14 without a showing of good cause, there is a potential to abuse that time and use it as carte blanche to
 15 buffer reports.

16 The Court's scheduling order and the Federal Rules do not contemplate double depositions per
 17 expert and align with Plaintiffs' position. ECF No. 458; Fed. R. Civ. P. 30. A party seeking two
 18 depositions of one witness must obtain leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(a)(2)(ii). Because expert
 19 reports are complex, and because lengthy reports require significant back and forth between expert and
 20 counsel, setting rules to govern the scope of discovery is advisable. *See* Federal Judicial Center, Manual
 21 for Complex Litigation, at 626 (4th ed. 2004). The Court's orders contain no such relevant provisions,
 22 because at no point during the two instances in the last three months that the parties stipulated to
 23 modify the Court's Scheduling Order (ECF Nos. 455, 458), or during the negotiation of the parties'
 24 Stipulated Order Regarding Deposition (ECF No. 447), did Defendants disclose their desire to depose

25
 26 ⁵Good cause is found where a party can show a good reason for the request, e.g., new evidence, new
 27 theories, new damages computations, and where unreasonable duplicativeness is not a risk. *See, e.g.,*
Graebner v. James River Corp., 130 F.R.D. 440, 441 (N.D. Cal. 1989); *In re Dynamic Random Access*
Memory (DRAM) Antitrust Litig., 2006 WL 3462580, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 29, 2006); *In re TFT-LCD*
(LCD) Antitrust Litig., 2014 WL 12639392, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014).

1 Plaintiffs' experts multiple times. Instead, the parties agreed to plan for eight weeks following the
 2 submission of expert reports to conduct and complete expert discovery.⁶ Defendants are raising this
 3 issue for the first time, and when they proposed it by email on January 22, they proposed a schedule
 4 that would have started the depositions of Plaintiffs' experts in less than one month.

5 Not only is such a truncated calendar with no notice logistically difficult to execute and an
 6 inefficient use of time, but there is also no showing at this juncture that the ordinary seven hours would
 7 be insufficient.⁷ Defendants assert that the basis for their proposal is so that they avoid a possibility that
 8 reports are misunderstood. But, an expansion of the rules or modifications to the Court's schedule
 9 should be made on a specific showing of actual need, not hypothetical, and with each party having the
 10 opportunity to be heard on a developed record (i.e., if and when a party needs to seek leave of Court for
 11 a second deposition). Second, clarification of testimony makes far more sense after the reports are
 12 complete than while rebuttals are in process. Third, the rules are meant to encourage each party to
 13 prepare independently rather than automatically benefit from preparatory work of the other side. Fed.
 14 R. Civ. P. 26 Advisory Committee Note ¶ 58 (1970) ("A party . . . can hardly hope to build his case out
 15 of his opponent's experts."); *see also Procongps, Inc. v. Skypatrol, LLC*, No. C 11-3975 SI, 2013 WL
 16 11261327, at *1 (N.D. Cal. May 22, 2013) (agreeing with plaintiff's argument that the purpose of expert
 17 depositions is to develop cross-examination for trial or for a Daubert motion, not to build a case for
 18 one's own expert, and that two rounds of depositions is impractical and wasteful).

19 Defendants rely on *LCD* and *DRAM*. Each is distinguishable. The facts in *LCD* show why
 20 Defendants are off-base. In *In re LCD Antitrust Litig.*, 2014 WL 12639392, Judge Illston presided over a
 21 multiparty multidistrict antitrust cartel case involving a series of direct purchaser class cases, indirect
 22 purchaser class cases and follow on opt-out cases. One opt-out used an expert who had testified
 23 repeatedly in prior cases offering the same substantive opinion. When that expert came up with a new
 24 damage calculation in rebuttal that increased damages by almost two-fold, Judge Illston ordered the

25
 26 ⁶The Scheduling Order set by the Court provides for: expert disclosures on January 21, expert rebuttals
 27 on March 21, and close of expert discovery on May 20, 2025. ECF Nos. 455, 458.

28 ⁷ This is true for everyone other than Dr. Murphy, for whom Plaintiffs seek additional time on a specific
 basis. Plaintiffs would likewise be amenable to considering a specific need for a particular witness.

1 expert deposition taken on the new opinion. Of course, here there is no such record because the rebuttal
 2 reports have not been issued. Indeed, taking depositions after the rebuttal would avoid such surprise
 3 and prevent depositions before opinions are final. The operative schedule heads off that problem by
 4 having depositions occur after reports are done. Similarly, in *In re DRAM Antitrust Litig.*, 2006 WL
 5 3462580, the witness offered a new calculation of damages in his rebuttal and the defendants had no
 6 opportunity to examine the witness, unlike here. In Defendants' third cited case—*In re Chicago Bridge*
 7 & Iron Co. N.V. Sec. Litig., 2019 WL 6879321, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 16, 2019)—defendants sought two
 8 depositions of only one expert, not arguably the six at issue here.

9 Requiring at the outset that a deposition occur both before and after a rebuttal report without a
 10 specific showing of a need to explore, *e.g.*, an additional opinion or methodology, substantially risks
 11 subjecting Plaintiffs' experts to unreasonably cumulative or duplicative discovery in violation of the
 12 Rules. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(c) (court may consider whether proposed discovery would be
 13 unreasonably cumulative or duplicative). The mere fact of submission of a rebuttal report is not a basis
 14 for two depositions. It is far more sensible to follow the Court's schedule, allow the experts to prepare
 15 their rebuttal reports without interruption, then proceed with depositions. Experts should have an
 16 opportunity to complete their analyses rather than be cross-examined before they are done. In addition
 17 to fairness, allowing experts to complete their work and to be examined on it in its entirety will provide
 18 for a clearer deposition record. Preparation for depositions will also disrupt the preparation of the
 19 rebuttals and could delay the Court schedule. Under Defendants' proposal, Plaintiffs' experts would
 20 redirect significant energy to deposition preparation rather than focus on rebuttal reports.

21 Finally, Defendants seem to confuse the need to take Dr. Murphy's deposition once for more
 22 than seven hours—with time divided between the two indirect classes and the direct class—with their
 23 proposal to preemptively seek to depose every single expert twice for seven hours each time. Plaintiffs'
 24 request for additional time for one expert deposition that is relevant to three distinct cases is clearly
 25 distinguishable.

26 Defendants' other proposal—to curb the deposition time from 14 to 12 hours, presumably, to still
 27 be used before and after rebuttal—does not address the disruption and unfairness of depositions taken
 28 during the preparation of the expert reports, or the inefficiency of duplicate sittings, travel, and costs.

1 Shaving two hours does not ameliorate the basic flaws with Defendants' approach. Further, 12 hours is
 2 unnecessary on the current record and without the complete expert testimony as represented by both
 3 rounds of reports.

4 Plaintiffs maintain that Defendants should not get a blanket stipulation for double depositions.
 5 Rather, they should show good cause as needed and where the Court decides good cause warrants
 6 additional time, Plaintiffs will provide their experts as indicated.

7 **Defendants' Position:**

8 After arguing that they are entitled to expanded deposition time with Defendants' economist,
 9 Plaintiffs argue that Defendants' opportunity to depose Plaintiffs' own economists should be strictly
 10 limited. Their proposal is both lacking in reciprocity and inconsistent with an effort to efficiently
 11 crystallize the points of dispute between the Parties' respective economics experts.

12 To start, Plaintiffs' contention that the existing schedule or the Parties' discussions contemplated
 13 that depositions would occur only after rebuttal reports were submitted is simply not accurate. The
 14 current schedule provides a period of 17 weeks for expert discovery and does not speak to when
 15 depositions will occur within that window. ECF No. 455. It is also incorrect that Defendants propose
 16 to "require" that experts be deposed twice. Under Defendants' proposal, Plaintiffs would be free to take
 17 a single deposition of each of Defendants' experts following rebuttal reports, of up to 12 or 14 hours if
 18 that expert submitted a rebuttal report. And contrary to Plaintiffs' assumption, this would not
 19 necessarily mean 20 depositions, as it would only apply to those witnesses for whom the parties
 20 perceived a need to file two separate reports.

21 Defendants submit that their experts' rebuttal analysis, and therefore also the task of the Court
 22 at the *Daubert* stage, will be greatly streamlined by ensuring that their rebuttal reports are actually
 23 responsive to the arguments and analyses on which Plaintiffs intend to rely – and not, for example,
 24 either built upon a misunderstanding of that analysis or a failure to address errors or omissions that may
 25 come to light only later during depositions. To that end, Defendants propose that each party be entitled
 26 to depose the opposing side's experts, if they so choose, on the reports they have already submitted,
 27 without prejudice to the right to depose those experts again on any rebuttal reports they may submit.
 28 No expert would be deposed more than once on any particular report, but for experts whom a party

1 elects to put forward *both* as an affirmative expert as well as for the purposes of rebutting the other
 2 side's experts, that dual-hatted expert may be deposed twice.

3 Plaintiffs erroneously claim the Federal Rules “do not contemplate double depositions,” but
 4 under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(a)(2), the Court “must grant leave” to take a second
 5 deposition of the Parties’ respective economics experts “to the extent consistent with Rule 26(b)(1) and
 6 (2).” Contrary to Plaintiffs’ assertion, Defendants need not show “good cause” for the second
 7 deposition, only that a second deposition is not “unreasonably cumulative or duplicative” and that the
 8 benefit of the deposition outweighs the burden and expense ‘considering the needs of the case, the
 9 amount in controversy, the parties’ resources, the importance of the issues and stake in the action, and
 10 the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues.”” *In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litig.*,
 11 2014 WL 12639392, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014). Indeed, in the case Plaintiffs cite for the “good
 12 cause” standard, the Court imposed the burden to demonstrate good cause for issuance of a protective
 13 order on the party *resisting* a second deposition of the plaintiff herself, not an expert witness. *See*
 14 *Graebner v. James River Corp.*, 130 F.R.D. 440, 441-42 (N.D. Cal. 1989) (“[Plaintiff] has shown good
 15 cause for a protective order.”); *see also Blackwell v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco*, 2010 WL 2608330,
 16 at *2 (N.D. Cal. June 25, 2010) (“[w]hether a second deposition is to be permitted should be based on
 17 the factors identified in Rule 26(b)(2), *none of which is good cause.*”) (emphasis added).

18 Here, the hundreds of millions of dollars in damages the Plaintiffs seek to recover, the
 19 complexity of the various analyses put forward—which Plaintiffs’ acknowledge—and the benefits of
 20 ensuring those expert analyses are fully understood before they are rebutted all counsel in favor of
 21 Defendants’ proposed approach. Plaintiffs’ claims for damages rely on three different, complex
 22 damages models reported across hundreds of pages of expert reports relying on more than 350
 23 gigabytes of data, computational models, and record evidence. The validity of those models will be a
 24 crucial element of class certification arguments, particularly the models’ ability to show classwide
 25 impact through common proof, including the existence of pass-through damages for the two indirect
 26 classes. And in this case the market conditions during the period in question were made more complex
 27 by the overlay of unusual extrinsic events – including the FDA’s regulatory regime for E-Vapor
 28 products, a substantial transformation of the market resulting from the introduction of disposable E-

1 Vapor products, significant settlements of litigation against JLI and Altria, and the ultimate unwinding
 2 of the transaction at issue in this case. The opinions offered by the Parties' economists in this case are a
 3 critical factor in this litigation, and economic analysis of this type is not necessarily intuitive,
 4 particularly to those untrained in the field. That complexity is only exacerbated by Plaintiffs' decision
 5 to submit three competing (and often inconsistent) economic models and economic analysis from five
 6 different experts. Recognizing the importance of expert analysis, the Parties have agreed that the Court
 7 should hold an evidentiary hearing on *Daubert* issues in the fall.

8 It would ill-serve the Parties and the Court, particularly at the *Daubert* stage, for Defendants'
 9 experts to prepare rebuttal expert reports only to find out later in the case that they had misunderstood
 10 the analysis of Plaintiffs' experts or the grounds for their opinions or were not responding to the
 11 analysis that Plaintiffs are actually putting forward. Likewise, it would be inefficient and potentially
 12 confusing for errors, omissions or potential biases in an expert's report to be revealed for the first time
 13 only in a post-rebuttal deposition. That would deprive the opposing party's experts the opportunity to
 14 address such issues and likely limit any response to lawyer argument in briefing on summary judgment
 15 or *Daubert*.

16 It is not unusual for two depositions of expert witnesses to be taken where the experts submit
 17 both an opening and rebuttal report, particularly in complex cases where doing so may streamline later
 18 proceedings. For example, in *In re Chicago Bridge & Iron Co. N.V. Sec. Litig.*, 2019 WL 6879321,
 19 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 16, 2019), where the schedule provided for two rounds of expert reports, the court ruled
 20 that each side should be permitted to depose the experts twice—after the opening report and then after
 21 the rebuttal report. Noting that “other courts have reached a similar conclusion” and collecting cases so
 22 holding, the court explained that “[t]his is a very complex case[] with millions of dollars at stake and
 23 many difficult issues on which expert testimony will be helpful. Given the amount of resources already
 24 expended during the discovery phase, an additional deposition or two is not a great burden or expense
 25 when taken in context.” *Id.* at *1-2; *see also*, e.g., *In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litig.*, 2014 WL
 26 12639392, at *2 (allowing deposition on rebuttal report because it will “increase the chances of an
 27 efficient trial”); *In re Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) Antitrust Litig.*, 2006 WL 3462580, at
 28 *1 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 29, 2006) (finding two depositions of expert to be the “fair result”). Plaintiffs’

1 attempt to distinguish these cases falls flat—the unifying theme of these opinions is that in complex
2 cases in which expert testimony is critical, the need for an additional deposition outweighs the costs or
3 burdens of having an expert sit for that deposition. In contrast, *Procongps, Inc. v. Skypatrol, LLC*, No.
4 C 11-3975 SI, 2013 WL 11261327, at *1 (N.D. Cal. May 22, 2013), on which Plaintiffs rely, is a simple
5 patent case and inapposite on the question of how to proceed in this type of complex litigation.

6 Plaintiffs’ proposal that Defendants wait to ask for a second deposition until after the rebuttal
7 deadline makes no sense. The need for these depositions is already apparent, and the issue should be
8 decided now while there remains plenty of time before expert rebuttal reports to schedule depositions.
9 Contrary to Plaintiffs’ suggestion, it does not make sense to require each party to make a separate
10 showing of good cause as to each expert who files a rebuttal report. The very fact that an expert
11 perceived the need to file two separate reports is what gives rise to the need for the second deposition.
12 Plaintiffs’ proposal would be unworkable because it would require each party to seek leave now
13 without having seen the rebuttal report or even knowing if the expert contemplated filing a second
14 report. Otherwise, the party would face the Hobson’s choice of taking the deposition now without
15 knowing whether it would have another deposition if the expert filed a separate rebuttal report or
16 playing it safe by foregoing the deposition and thus losing the opportunity to depose the expert before
17 rebuttal reports are due.

18 Nor is there merit to Plaintiffs’ contention that there would be a “clearer deposition record” if
19 each expert is deposed only once. To the contrary, the record will be much clearer if rebuttal reports are
20 fully responsive to the expert analyses they are intended to rebut. As for the suggestion that Defendants
21 are seeking “preparatory work of the other side,” that is hardly the case—Defendants are seeking to
22 depose experts who Plaintiffs have put forth affirmatively on the reports they have actually submitted.
23 Indeed, Plaintiffs’ own rebuttal analyses would likely benefit from their experts having gone through
24 the process of being deposed on their opening reports.

25 The usual considerations that militate against multiple depositions of fact witnesses do not apply
26 to these expert witnesses. All are professionals who are well compensated for their time, including
27 their deposition time, and Defendants have agreed to depose Plaintiffs’ experts at the location of their
28 choosing (including, at their request, outside the United States). All chose to offer their services in this

1 litigation; they are not being summoned involuntarily. Plaintiffs' suggestion that arranging depositions
 2 now would be "logistically difficult to execute" is wrong: the parties have already largely agreed to
 3 dates on which these depositions could occur. And all parties are represented by teams of experienced
 4 counsel who are more than able to manage the schedule that has been agreed. Plaintiffs have pointed to
 5 no prejudice that would arise from taking multiple depositions of experts that submit multiple reports
 6 beyond the burden of preparing for depositions. But any burden raised by the expense of "preparing
 7 for, traveling to, and taking the deposition" is insufficient to outweigh the benefits discussed above of
 8 allowing experts to be deposed on each of their reports. *In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litig.*,
 9 2014 WL 12639392, at *2.

10 In an effort to reach a compromise, Defendants proposed a bilateral solution that allows each
 11 side to take 12 hours total of expert deposition time for any expert who offers two reports, with the time
 12 divided however the deposing party chooses. If, for example, Plaintiffs wanted to depose Dr. Murphy
 13 only after the rebuttal reports were submitted, this would allow Plaintiffs to do so. Defendants remain
 14 amenable to that type of accommodation. But Plaintiffs have been unwilling to consider any
 15 alternatives to their position that *they* should be allowed a two-day deposition of Defendants' economic
 16 expert, while *Defendants* are limited to a single 7-hour deposition of each of theirs, even if those
 17 experts submit both opening and rebuttal reports.

18 II. ADDITIONAL ITEMS

19 **Proposal for Evidentiary Hearing.** A hearing on *Daubert* motions is currently set for October
 20 9, 2025. Briefing on *Daubert* motions is scheduled to be completed on September 8, 2025. The Parties
 21 are in agreement and respectfully request that the Court hold an evidentiary hearing on the admissibility
 22 of expert testimony in conjunction with that hearing.

23 **Stipulation as to Authenticity.** The Parties are near agreement on a joint stipulation regarding
 24 the authenticity of documents produced by the Parties in this action and the accuracy of certain phone
 25 logs and text messages produced in the FTC action. The Parties will continue to meet and confer on the
 26 issue and anticipate filing the stipulation shortly.

27 All parties each reserve their respective rights.

28

1 DATED: February 4, 2025

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP

By: /s/ Joseph R. Saveri
Joseph R. Saveri

Joseph R. Saveri (SBN 130064)
Ronnie S. Spiegel (*pro hac vice*)
David H. Seidel (SBN 307135)
Itak K. Moradi (SBN 310537)
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
rspiegel@saverilawfirm.com
dseidel@saverilawfirm.com
imoradi@saverilawfirm.com

Interim Lead Counsel for Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs

**ZWERLING, SCHACHTER &
ZWERLING, LLP**

By: /s/ Robin F. Zwerling
Robin F. Zwerling

Robin F. Zwerling (*pro hac vice*)
Susan Salvetti (*pro hac vice*)
Justin M. Tarshis (*pro hac vice*)
41 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 223-3900
Email: rzwerling@zsz.com
ssalvetti@zsz.com
jt tarshis@zsz.com

*Interim Lead Counsel for Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and
Indirect Reseller Plaintiffs*

KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP

By: /s/ Elana Katcher
Elana Katcher

Robert N. Kaplan (*pro hac vice*)
Elana Katcher (*pro hac vice*)
800 Third Avenue, 38th Floor
New York, NY 10022

1 Telephone: (212) 687-1980
2 Email: rkaplan@kaplanfox.com
ekatcher@kaplanfox.com

3 *Steering Committee Counsel for Indirect Purchaser*
4 *Plaintiffs and Indirect Reseller Plaintiffs*

5 **CERA LLP**

6 By: /s/ C. Andrew Dirksen
C. Andrew Dirksen

7 C. Andrew Dirksen (SBN 197378)
8 529 Main St., Suite P200
9 Boston, MA 02129
Telephone: (857) 453-6555
Email: cdirksen@cerallp.com

10 Solomon B. Cera (SBN 099467)
Pamela A. Markert (SBN 203780)

11 **CERA LLP**
12 201 California Street, Suite 1240
13 San Francisco, CA 94111
14 Telephone: (415) 777-2230
15 Email: scera@cerallp.com
pmarkert@cerallp.com

16 *Steering Committee Counsel for Indirect Purchaser*
17 *Plaintiffs and Indirect Reseller Plaintiffs*

18 **WILKINSON STEKLOFF LLP**

19 By: /s/ Beth A. Wilkinson
Beth A. Wilkinson

20 Beth A. Wilkinson (*pro hac vice*)
James M. Rosenthal (*pro hac vice*)
Matthew Skanchy (*pro hac vice*)
Alysha Bohanon (*pro hac vice*)
Jenna Pavelec (*pro hac vice*)
21 2001 M Street, N.W., 10th Floor
22 Washington, D.C. 20036
23 Telephone: (202) 847-4000
24 Email: bwilkinson@wilkinsonstekloff.com
jrosenthal@wilkinsonstekloff.com
mskanchy@wilkinsonstekloff.com
abohanon@wilkinsonstekloff.com
jpavelec@wilkinsonstekloff.com

1 Moira Penza (*pro hac vice*)
2 Jeremy Barber (*pro hac vice*)
3 **WILKINSON STEKLOFF LLP**
4 West 42nd Street, 24th Floor
5 New York, New York 10036
6 Telephone: (212) 294-8910
7 Email: mpenza@wilkinsonstekloff.com
8 jbarber@wilkinsonstekloff.com

9 Lauren S. Wulfe (SBN 287592)
10 **ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP**
11 777 South Figueroa Street, Forty-Fourth Floor
12 Los Angeles, California 90017
13 Telephone: 213-243-4000
14 Email: Lauren.Wulfe@arnoldporter.com

15 *Counsel for Defendants Altria Group, Inc. and Altria*
16 *Enterprises LLC*

17 **CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP**

18 By: /s/ Nowell D. Bamberger
19 Nowell D. Bamberger

20 David I. Gelfand (*pro hac vice*)
21 Jeremy J. Calsyn (State Bar No. 205062)
22 Nowell D. Bamberger (*pro hac vice*)
23 2112 Pennsylvania Avenue
24 NW Washington, DC 20037
25 Telephone: (202) 974-1500
26 Email: dgelfand@cgsh.com
27 jcalsyn@cgsh.com
28 nbamberger@cgsh.com

29 *Counsel for Defendant Juul Labs, Inc.*

30 **KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD, FIGEL &**
31 **FREDERICK, P.L.L.C.**

32 By: /s/ Michael J. Guzman
33 Michael J. Guzman

34 Mark C. Hansen (*pro hac vice*)
35 Michael J. Guzman (*pro hac vice*)
36 David L. Schwarz (CA Bar No. 206257)
37 Andrew Skaras (*pro hac vice*)
38 1615 M Street, NW Suite 400
39 Washington, DC 20036

1 Telephone: (202) 326-7900
2 Email: mhansen@kellogghansen.com
3 mguzman@kellogghansen.com
4 dschwarz@kellogghansen.com
5 askaras@kellogghansen.com

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Counsel for Individual Defendants Nicholas Pritzker
and Riaz Valani

L.R. 5-1 SIGNATURE ATTESTATION

As the ECF user whose user ID and password are utilized in the filing of this document, I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in the filing of the document has been obtained from each of the other signatories.

Dated: February 4, 2025

By: */s/ Joseph R. Saveri*
Joseph R. Saveri